DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 192 JC 900 598

AUTHOR Pullen, Deborah B.; Sistrunk, Walter E.
TITLE Ideal and Actual Supervisory Behavior as Perceived by Mississippi Community College Vocational Instructors and Their Supervisors.
PUB DATE 14 Nov 90
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of Mid-South Educational Research Association (19th, New Orleans, LA, November 13-16, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administration; Administrator Characteristics; Community Colleges; Cooperation; Interprofessional Relationship; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); Social Cognition; State Surveys; *Supervisory Methods; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Supervision; Two Year Colleges; *Vocational Directors; Vocational Education; *Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Mississippi

ABSTRACT

In November 1989, a study was conducted to determine if there were significant differences between ideal and actual supervisory behaviors of community college vocational supervisors, as perceived by vocational instructors and by the supervisors themselves. A random sample of 35 supervisors and 378 vocational instructors was selected from all Mississippi community college vocational personnel. The survey instrument was the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire. Study findings, based on responses from 243 instructors and 24 supervisors, included the following: (1) instructors perceived significantly more actual supervisory activity than did the supervisors; (2) supervisors perceived themselves to be more directive, more collaborative, and less non-directive than instructors perceived them to be; (3) the only difference found in perceptions of ideal supervisory behavior was that instructors believed there should be more supervision by supervisors in the area of staffing; (4) supervisors felt that they were providing more supervision than they should and that they should be providing more non-directive supervision; (5) instructors felt that their supervisors should be more directive and collaborative, and, overall, should provide less supervision; and (6) when variables of race, gender, and highest degree held were considered, whites perceived their supervisors to be providing more supervision, non-whites perceived their supervisors to be providing more directive supervision, females perceived more supervisory activity than males, and no differences were found in perceptions based on highest degree held by instructor. Data tables are appended. (GFW)

ED325192

Ideal and Actual Supervisory Behavior as Perceived by Mississippi Community College Vocational Instructors and Their Supervisors

By

Deborah B. Pullen
Assistant Vocational Director
East Mississippi Community College

and

Walter E. Sistrunk
Professor Emeritus
Mississippi State University

Presented at the Annual Conference
of Mid-South Educational Research Association
(19th, New Orleans, LA, November 13-16, 1990).

New Orleans, Louisiana
November 14, 1990

JC900598

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D.B. Pullen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Need for the Study

The need for this study is based on the premise that supervision exists for the purpose of improving instruction and learning, and how well this purpose is achieved "depends upon the skill and efficiency of the supervisor in working with teachers" (Harris, 1963).

The supervision of community college vocational instructors is complicated by the diversity of educational and work backgrounds of the personnel supervised. Educational backgrounds range from high school diplomas to doctorates. College degrees held are in both education and non-education fields, and work experience ranges from two years to over 20 years. Therefore, an extremely diverse group of individuals is employed in the instructional field.

Community college administrative personnel, like the instructors, have diverse backgrounds. They must hold a "Class A" vocational license; hold a Master's degree which includes 12 semester hours of graduate credit in school administration and supervision; have a minimum of 15 semester hours in vocational education; and have at least two years of vocational teaching experience, counseling or other vocational administrative experience (Ms. State Dept. of Ed., 1988). The diversity of backgrounds is found in the fact that an administrator's undergraduate study and experience may be in any area of vocational education. Administrators may have degrees and

experience in areas ranging from business to health occupations to engineering.

The diversity of the backgrounds of community college vocational teachers and their supervisors is not necessarily a detriment to the educational system. It is considered by many to be one of the contributing factors to the success of community colleges. Yet, it is one of the factors which complicates supervision of community college vocational instructors.

The need for this study is also demonstrated by the fact that very little research has been conducted on supervisory behavior in community college vocational centers. Further research is needed in this area in order to broaden the knowledge of the subject and thus improve the supervisory skills of current and prospective supervisors.

Statement of the Problem

The problem was to determine if there were significant differences between ideal and actual supervisory behaviors of community college vocational supervisors as self-perceived and as perceived by community college vocational instructors.

In order to structure the problem, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. Are there significant differences between the actual supervisory behaviors as perceived by Mississippi community college vocational instructors and their supervisors when measured by (a) the total scores of the SBDQ-Form 1, (b) the sub-scale scores of the SBDQ-Form 1, and (c) the dimensional scores of the SBDQ-Form 1?

2. Are there significant differences between the ideal supervisory behaviors as perceived by Mississippi community college vocational instructors and their supervisors when

measured by (a) the total scores of the SBDQ-Form 1, (b) the sub-scale scores of the SBDQ-Form 1, and (c) the dimensional scores of the SBDQ-Form 1?

3. Are there significant differences between the actual supervisory behaviors and the ideal supervisory behaviors as perceived by the supervisors when measured by (a) the total scores of the SBDQ-Form 1, (b) the sub-scale scores of the SBDQ-Form 1, and (c) the dimensional scores of the SBDQ-Form 1?

4. Are there significant differences between the actual supervisory behaviors and the ideal supervisory behaviors as perceived by the instructors when measured by (a) the total scores of the SBDQ-Form 1, (b) the sub-scale scores of the SBDQ-Form 1, and (c) the dimensional scores of the SBDQ-Form 1?

5. Are there significant differences between the actual supervisory behaviors and the ideal supervisory behaviors as perceived by the instructors when measured by (a) the total scores of the SBDQ-Form 1, (b) the sub-scale scores of the SBDQ-Form 1, and (c) the dimensional scores of the SBDQ-Form 1 when the variables of "race", "gender", and "highest degree held" are considered?

Instrument

The Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ),Form 1 was the instrument used in the study. The SBDQ, Form 1 developed in 1981 by Walter E. Sistrunk, Professor of Educational Leadership at Mississippi State University. It is an ordinal scale composed of eight subscales or task areas: (1) Developing the Curriculum; (2) Organizing for Instruction; (3) Staffing; (4) Providing Materials and Facilities; (5) Staff Development; (6) Coordinating Special Student Services; (7) Developing School Community Relations as it Pertains to the Instructional Program; and (8) Evaluating Instruction and Instructors. Each subscale is composed of triads of statements

which define supervisory behavior as being in directive, non-directive, or collaborative dimensions (Sistrunk, 1986).

Population and Sample

The population consisted of all Mississippi community college vocational supervisors and all Mississippi community college vocational instructors of Agriculture, Business Technology, Cooperative and Marketing Education, Allied Health and Related Technology, Vocational Home Economics, Trade and Technical Education, and Disadvantaged programs. The names of 756 possible participants were obtained from the Service Area Directories published by the Mississippi Bureau of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education.

The sample consisted all the community college vocational instructional supervisors, as named by the District Vocational Directors, and 50 percent of the instructors under their supervision. A table of random numbers was used to select the instructors from each of the 35 main and branch campuses which offer vocational education programs. The number of participants selected for the study was 35 supervisors and 378 instructors.

Collection of the Data

After permission was obtained from the Mississippi State University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, from Walter E. Sistrunk to use the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form 1, and from Elwyn Wheat, Associate State Superintendent of Education for Vocational Education, the first step of the data collection

process began in November, 1989, with a request to the Mississippi Bureau of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education for a complete list of addresses for Mississippi's 15 community college presidents and district vocational directors as well as the most current service area directories for Agriculture, Business Technology, Cooperative and Marketing Education, Allied Health and Related Technology, Vocational Home Economics, Trade and Technical Education, and the Disadvantaged program. Upon receipt of these materials, each of the community college presidents was contacted in order to obtain permission to conduct research in his district. The letter of request contained a letter of introduction from Lamar Moody, Head of the Department of Educational Leadership at Mississippi State University as well as a personal letter explaining the research, a form on which to indicate approval or disapproval, and a stamped, addressed envelope in which to return the form. Any community college president who did not respond within ten days was contacted by telephone.

The next step in the data collection process was to obtain permission from the district vocational directors. Each district vocational director was sent a personal letter, a copy of the permission form from his community college president, and a copy of the letter of approval from Elwyn Wheat as well as a form on which to indicate his approval or disapproval. In addition, each district vocational director was sent an information form on which to list the name of each vocational campus in the district,

the instructional supervisor on each campus, and one contact person per campus. Any district vocational director who did not respond within ten days was contacted by telephone.

Based upon the campuses listed by the district vocational directors, a list of the campuses to be included in the study was compiled. The instructors on each campus to be included in the study were then identified in the Agriculture, Business Technology, Allied Health and Related Technology, Vocational Home Economics, Trade and Technical Education, and Disadvantaged program service area directories and put in numerical order from one to 756. Next, a sample of 50 percent of the instructors, or 378, was drawn by using a table of random numbers. The instructional supervisors included in the study were identified by the district vocational director with one instructional supervisor per campus being included.

After the sample for the study was identified, each instructional supervisor selected for participation was contacted by phone in order to obtain permission to conduct the research on his or her campus. After this permission was received, each campus contact person was contacted by phone and asked to assist with the dissemination of the questionnaires, answer sheets, and demographic data sheets. All the contact persons recommended by the district vocational directors agreed to provide assistance.

Each campus contact person was mailed an introductory letter and a list of the participants on his or her campus as well as a packet of Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaires - Form

1, answer sheets, demographic data sheets, and an addressed, stamped envelope in which to return the answer sheets and demographic data sheets. The contact persons were asked to distribute the forms, have them completed by the participants, and return the answer sheets and demographic data sheets within ten days of receipt. Any contact person who did not respond within ten days was contacted by telephone.

Findings

Question 1 asked if there were significant differences in the actual supervisory behavior perceptions of the instructors and supervisors. One-way analysis of variance was used to analyze the data. Findings are shown in Table 1.

In response to Question 1, instructors perceived significantly more supervisory activity than did the supervisors. When dimensional scores were considered, the supervisors perceived themselves to be more directive, more collaborative, and less non-directive than the instructors perceived them to be.

When subscale scores were considered, instructors perceived significantly more supervision than did the supervisors in the areas of Developing the Curriculum, Organizing for Instruction, Staffing, Providing Materials and Facilities, and Developing School Community Relations.

Insert Table 1.

Question 2 asked if there were significant differences in the ideal supervisory behavior perceptions of the instructors and supervisors. One-way analysis of variance was used to analyze the data. Findings are shown in Table 2.

In response to Question 2, the only significant difference between the ideal perceptions of instructors and supervisors was found in the area of staffing. In this area, instructors perceived that there should be more supervision.

Insert Table 2.

Question 3 asked if there were significant differences between the actual and ideal supervisory behavior perceptions of the supervisors. A t test was used to analyze the data. Findings are shown in Table 3.

In response to question 3, when the total scores were analyzed, the supervisors felt that they were providing more supervision than they should. When the dimensions were considered, the supervisors felt that they should be more non-directive. When subscale scores were analyzed, the supervisors perceived that they should provide less supervision in the area of Organizing for Instruction.

Insert Table 3.

Question 4 asked in there were significant differences between the actual and ideal supervisory behavior perceptions of the instructors. A t test was used to analyze the data. Findings are shown in Table 4.

In response to question 4, significant differences were found in the total scores, dimensional scores, and all subscale scores. When the total scores were analyzed, instructors perceived that their supervisors should be providing less or different types of supervisory behaviors than they were providing. On the dimensional scores, the instructors perceived that their supervisors should be more directive, more collaborative, and less non-directive than they were. On all of the subscale scores, the instructors preferred that their supervisors provide less supervision.

Insert Table 4.

Question 5 asked if there were significant differences between the instructors' actual and ideal supervisory behavior perceptions when the variables of "race", "gender", and "highest degree held" were considered. Multivariate analysis of variance was utilized in the data analysis. Findings are shown in Tables 5-10.

When actual supervisory behavior perceptions of the instructors was analyzed according to race, caucasians perceived their supervisors to be providing more supervision. When dimensional scores were considered, non-caucasians perceived

their supervisors to be providing significantly more directive supervision. In keeping with this, caucasians perceived their supervisors to be more non-directive. When subscale scores were considered, caucasians perceived more supervision than did non-caucasians in Developing Curriculum, Organizing for Instruction, and Staff Development. Findings are shown in Table 5.

Insert Table 5.

When ideal supervisory behavior perceptions of instructors were considered according to race, caucasians perceived that there should be greater change in their supervisors in the areas of Developing the Curriculum, Organizing for Instruction, and Evaluating Instruction and Instructors. Findings are shown in Table 6.

Insert Table 6.

When the actual supervisory behavior perceptions of males and females were compared, females perceived more supervisory activity than did males. When subscale scores were considered, they also perceived more supervisory behavior in the areas of Organizing for Instruction, Staff Development, and Coordinating Special Student Services. Findings are shown in Table 7.

Insert Table 7.

When the ideal supervisory behavior perceptions of males and females were analyzed, females perceived that there should be more or different types of supervision. They also perceived that there should be more or different types of supervision in the areas of Developing the Curriculum, Organizing for Instruction, Staff Development, Coordinating Special Student Services, and Developing School Community Relations. Findings are shown in Table 8.

Insert Table 8.

When the variable of highest degree held was considered, no significant differences were found in the instructors' actual or ideal supervisory behavior perceptions. Findings are shown in Tables 9-10.

Insert Tables 9 and 10.

Recommendations

As a result of this study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. A similar study should be conducted comparing ideal and actual supervisory behavior perceptions when considering the dimensions within each subscale of the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form 1.
2. Due to the fact that many community college vocational instructors hold Associate of Applied Science degrees (AAS), a similar study should be conducted including the AAS as a degree level.
3. Similar studies should be conducted in other states in order to determine if supervisory behavior perceptions differ in other locations.
4. A similar study should be conducted using age, years of experience, and subject area taught as variables.
5. Supervisors should carefully consider the findings of the research. This is particularly warranted because there were significant differences between instructors' actual and ideal supervisory behavior perceptions on the total scores, dimensional scores, and all eight subscales.
6. Educational leadership progams should place more emphasis on the study of styles of supervisory behavior.

APPENDIX

Table 1

COMPARISON OF ACTUAL SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS AS PERCEIVED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTORS AND THEIR SUPERVISORS

	Instructors (N = 243)		Supervisors (N = 24)		
SBDQ Scores	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	F Ratio
TOTAL	111.42	23.46	98.21	14.54	7.32*
Directive Dimension	13.94	11.07	18.71	9.68	4.14*
Collaborative Dim.	19.54	13.86	26.67	9.51	6.05*
Non-directive Dim.	24.09	15.36	12.88	8.34	12.41*
SUBSCALES:					
1-Developing the Curriculum	11.83	2.72	10.63	1.69	4.51*
2-Organizing for Instruction	11.92	2.35	10.58	2.43	7.05*
3-Staffing	10.49	2.84	8.63	1.86	9.90*
4-Providing Materials and Facilities	12.93	2.93	11.29	1.88	7.20*
5-Staff Development	22.65	6.35	20.29	3.69	3.21
6-Coordinating Special Student Services	13.88	4.79	12.46	3.49	2.02
7-Developing School and Community Relationships	11.75	3.72	10.13	2.52	4.39*
8-Evaluating Instruction and Instructors	15.96	5.07	14.21	4.19	2.69

*F Ratio significant at the .05 level ($F \geq 3.84$; df 1,265)

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF IDEAL SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS AS PERCEIVED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTORS AND THEIR SUPERVISORS

	Instructors (N = 243)		Supervisors (N = 24)		
SBDQ Scores	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	F Ratio
TOTAL	96.21	18.05	91.75	16.00	1.36
Directive Dimension	16.74	11.88	20.46	11.73	2.14
Collaborative Dim.	25.84	12.79	24.58	11.02	.22
Non-directive Dim.	9.26	9.64	7.38	7.26	.87
SUBSCALES:					
1-Developing the Curriculum	.75	1.15	.83	1.05	.12
2-Organizing for Instruction	10.42	2.36	9.75	2.07	1.79
3-Staffing	9.49	2.38	8.13	1.68	7.48*
4-Providing Materials and Facilities	11.10	2.50	10.67	2.33	.66
5-Staff Development	19.02	4.79	18.63	4.47	.15
6-Coordinating Special Student Services	12.00	3.59	11.54	2.26	.37
7-Developing School and Community Relationships	9.95	3.05	9.04	3.01	1.93
8-Evaluating Instruction and Instructors	14.18	3.37	14.21	3.40	.00

*F Ratio significant at the .05 level ($F \geq 3.84$; df 1,265)

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF ACTUAL AND IDEAL SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS AS PERCEIVED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE VOCATIONAL SUPERVISORS

	Actual (N = 24)		Ideal (N = 24)		
SBDQ Scores	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	t Value
TOTAL	58.25	6.21	52.42	1.91	6.58*
Directive Dimension	13.71	9.68	20.46	11.73	.75
Collaborative Dim.	26.67	9.51	24.50	11.02	.89
Non-directive Dim.	12.88	8.34	7.38	7.26	3.17*
SUBSCALES:					
1-Developing the Curriculum	10.63	1.69	9.79	1.47	2.01
2-Organizing for Instruction	10.50	2.43	9.75	2.07	2.10*
3-Staffing	8.63	1.86	8.13	1.68	1.47
4-Providing Materials and Facilities	11.29	1.88	10.67	2.33	1.74
5-Staff Development	20.29	3.69	18.63	4.47	1.75
6-Coordinating Special Student Services	12.46	3.49	11.54	2.27	1.31
7-Developing School and Community Relationships	10.13	2.53	9.04	3.01	1.84
8-Evaluating Instruction and Instructors	14.21	4.19	14.21	3.40	.00

*t value significant at the .05 level ($F \geq 2.069$; df 23)

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF ACTUAL AND IDEAL SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS AS PERCEIVED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTORS

	Actual (N = 243)		Ideal (N = 243)		
SBDQ Scores	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	t Value
TOTAL	57.58	7.57	51.84	3.37	15.03*
Directive Dimension	13.94	11.07	16.74	11.88	3.80*
Collaborative Dim.	19.54	13.86	25.84	12.79	6.65*
Non-directive Dim.	24.09	15.36	9.26	9.64	14.82*
SUBSCALES:					
1-Developing the Curriculum	11.83	2.72	10.06	2.25	10.08*
2-Organizing for Instruction	11.92	2.35	10.42	2.36	9.31*
3-Staffing	10.49	2.84	9.49	2.39	5.55*
4-Providing Materials and Facilities	12.93	2.93	11.10	2.50	9.96*
5-Staff Development	22.65	6.35	19.02	4.79	9.01*
6-Coordinating Special Student Services	13.88	4.79	12.00	3.59	7.23*
7-Developing School and Community Relationships	11.75	3.72	9.95	3.05	7.65*
8-Evaluating Instruction and Instructors	15.96	5.07	14.18	3.77	6.07*

*t value significant at the .05 level ($F \geq 1.96$; df 242)

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF ACTUAL SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS AS PERCEIVED BY CAUCASIAN AND NON-CAUCASIAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTORS

SBDQ Scores	Caucasian (N = 216) Adjusted Mean	Non-Caucasian (N = 27) Adjusted Mean	F Ratio
TOTAL	112.81	100.31	7.18*
Directive Dimension	13.09	20.75	12.23*
Collaborative Dim.	19.47	20.08	.05
Non-directive Dim.	22.41	15.59	6.49*
SUBSCALES:			
1-Developing the Curriculum	12.07	9.93	19.89*
2-Organizing for Instruction	12.05	10.86	6.51*
3-Staffing	10.55	10.02	.80
4-Providing Materials and Facilities	13.05	11.98	3.38
5-Staff Development	23.04	19.55	7.66*
6-Coordinating Special Student Services	14.05	12.55	2.38
7-Developing School and Community Relationships	11.88	10.69	2.51
8-Evaluating Instruction and Instructors	16.12	14.72	1.81

*Significant at the .05 level ($F \geq 3.84$; df 1,243)

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF IDEAL SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS AS PERCEIVED BY CAUCASIAN AND NON-CAUCASIAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTORS

SBDQ Scores	Caucasian (N = 216) Adjusted Mean	Non-Caucasian (N = 27) Adjusted Mean	F Ratio
TOTAL	96.83	91.22	2.47
Directive Dimension	16.51	18.56	.75
Collaborative Dim.	25.72	26.76	.16
Non-directive Dim.	9.62	6.37	2.78
SUBSCALES:			
1-Developing the Curriculum	10.22	8.81	10.57*
2-Organizing for Instruction	10.57	9.20	9.17*
3-Staffing	9.49	9.46	.00
4-Providing Materials and Facilities	11.17	10.55	1.49
5-Staff Development	19.11	18.32	.66
6-Coordinating Special Student Services	12.02	11.85	.05
7-Developing School and Community Relationships	9.90	10.33	.47
8-Evaluating Instruction and Instructors	14.36	12.70	4.78*

*Significant at the .05 level ($F \geq 3.84$; df 1,243)

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF ACTUAL SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS AS PERCEIVED BY MALE AND FEMALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTORS

SBDQ Scores	Male (N = 124) Adjusted Mean	Female (N = 119) Adjusted Mean	F Ratio
TOTAL	107.81	115.19	5.94*
Directive Dimension	14.17	13.70	.11
Collaborative Dim.	19.51	19.57	.00
Non-directive Dim.	20.34	23.02	2.39
SUBSCALES:			
1-Developing the Curriculum	11.57	12.11	2.57
2-Organizing for Instruction	11.63	12.22	3.90*
3-Staffing	10.24	10.75	1.79
4-Providing Materials and Facilities	12.63	13.24	2.64
5-Staff Development	21.73	23.61	5.27*
6-Coordinating Special Student Services	13.19	14.60	4.97*
7-Developing School and Community Relationships	11.44	12.08	1.71
8-Evaluating Instruction and Instructors	15.37	16.57	3.17

*Significant at the .05 level)F $\geq$ 3.84; df 1,243)

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF IDEAL SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS AS PERCEIVED BY MALE AND FEMALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTORS

SBDQ Scores	Male (N = 124) Adjusted Mean	Female (N = 119) Adjusted Mean	F Ratio
TOTAL	92.82	99.74	8.94*
Directive Dimension	18.10	15.33	3.24
Collaborative Dim.	25.20	26.50	.59
Non-directive Dim.	8.10	10.47	3.51
SUBSCALES:			
1-Developing the Curriculum	9.72	10.42	6.25*
2-Organizing for Instruction	9.87	10.99	14.75*
3-Staffing	9.22	9.77	3.09
4-Providing Materials and Facilities	10.85	11.36	2.47
5-Staff Development	18.35	19.72	4.79*
6-Coordinating Special Student Services	11.51	12.51	4.36*
7-Developing School and Community Relationships	9.51	10.41	5.04*
8-Evaluating Instruction and Instructors	13.80	14.57	2.44

*Significant at the .05 level ($F \geq 3.84$; df 1,243)

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF ACTUAL SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS AS PERCEIVED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTORS OF VARIOUS DEGREE LEVELS

SBDQ Scores	High School/ GED Graduate (N = 70) Adjusted Mean	Bachelor's Degree (N = 72) Adjusted Mean	Master's & Above (N = 101) Adjusted Mean	F Ratio
TOTAL	110.18	109.90	113.36	.59
Directive Dimension	13.78	15.32	13.07	.92
Collaborative Dim.	20.74	20.15	18.28	.70
Non-directive Dim.	20.64	20.39	23.25	1.22
SUBSCALES:				
1-Developing the Curriculum	12.08	11.27	12.06	2.49
2-Organizing for Instruction	11.72	11.82	12.13	.70
3-Staffing	10.45	10.88	10.24	1.02
4-Providing Materials and Facilities	12.66	12.78	13.23	.91
5-Staff Development	21.79	22.33	23.47	1.57
6-Coordinating Special Student Services	13.79	13.98	13.87	.03
7-Developing School and Community Relationships	11.53	11.46	12.11	.78
8-Evaluating Instruction and Instructors	16.15	15.37	16.25	.69

*Significant at the .05 level ($F \geq 3.00$; df 2,243)

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF IDEAL SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS AS PERCEIVED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTORS OF VARIOUS DEGREE LEVELS

SBDQ Scores	High School/ GED Graduate (N = 70) Adjusted Mean	Bachelor's Degree (N = 72) Adjusted Mean	Master's & Above (N = 101) Adjusted Mean	F Ratio
TOTAL	94.26	96.38	97.45	.66
Directive Dimension	17.67	16.89	15.99	.42
Collaborative Dim.	26.50	25.62	25.54	.13
Non-directive Dim.	7.86	9.41	10.12	1.13
SUBSCALES:				
1-Developing the Curriculum	10.12	9.96	10.09	.12
2-Organizing for Instruction	10.21	10.32	10.64	.83
3-Staffing	9.03	9.87	9.53	2.24
4-Providing Materials and Facilities	10.89	11.19	11.18	.34
5-Staff Development	18.25	18.92	19.63	1.71
6-Coordinating Special Student Services	11.96	12.16	11.92	.10
7-Developing School and Community Relationships	9.84	10.16	9.88	.25
8-Evaluating Instruction and Instructors	13.97	13.80	14.60	1.07

*Significant at the .05 level ($F \geq 3.00$; df 2,243)

SELECTED REFERENCES

Harris, Ben M. Supervisory Behavior in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Mississippi State Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education. Competency Based Licensure for Postsecondary Vocational-Technical Personnel. Jackson, 1988.

Sistrunk, Walter E. "A Manual for the Administration of the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaires, Forms 1 and 2". Okolona, Mississippi: Sistrunk Enterprises, 1986.

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES

DEC 21 1990